

REMARKS

The present amendment is submitted in conjunction with a Request for Continued Examination and in response to the final Office Action dated November 14, 2007, which set a three-month period for response, making this amendment due by February 14, 2008.

Claims 4-16 are pending in this application.

In the final Office Action, claims 1-5 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,671,815 to Kabatnik et al. Claims 6-7 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kabatnik.

In the present amendment, claim 1 has been canceled and rewritten as new independent claim 17, which includes the features of original claim 1 and additionally recites the features of claims 2 and 3, both of which also were canceled.

In addition, new claim 17 includes the limitations discussed by the Examiner and the Applicants' attorney during a personal conference, specifically, the features that the guide sleeve extends in a longitudinal direction, the power supply module received in the guide sleeve moves in the longitudinal direction, and the form-locking element is disposed in an end region of the guide sleeve facing away from the introduction opening as viewed in the longitudinal direction.

Claim 10 was amended to add the features of claims 11 and 13, both of which were canceled, and to further define the longitudinal direction.

Independent claims 17 and 10 are neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious over the cited reference to Kabatnik et al. In Kabatnik, the legs 571, b do not face away from the guiding opening 59 ***over a limited portion of the guide sleeve*** as defined in new claim 17. Rather, the legs face away from the sleeve opening in the longitudinal direction over about 2/3 of the length of the opening 59. A 2/3 portion clearly is not a limited portion of the guide sleeve.

As disclosed in Kabatnik et al, the openings of the web 56 between the web 56 and the contact plates 54 (incorrectly numbered as 59 in Fig. 5) do not only extend over a limited portion of the introduction dome as defined in amended claim 10. Instead, they extend over the entire length of the introduction dome 53.

The advantages of providing a rib and a recess which extend only over a limited portion of the guide sleeve and the introduction dome, respectively, is described in the specification of the present application on page 5, lines 9-16.

Because new claim 17 (i.e., rewritten claim 1) includes features that are not disclosed or suggested by Kabatnik et al, the rejection under Section 102 cannot stand. MPEP section 2131 requires that to anticipate a claim a reference must teach every element of the claim in as complete detail as is contained in the Applicant's claim.

The application in its amended state is believed to be in condition for allowance. Action to this end is courteously solicited. However, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, the undersigned would

very much welcome a telephone call in order to discuss appropriate claim language that will place the application into condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 27233
103 East Neck Road
Huntington, New York 11743
631-549-4700